Granite State Employment Project

Work Incentives Infrastructure in New Hampshire

Meeting with John Coburn
National Consortium for Health Systems Development (NCHSD)
December 1, 2009
9:30 – 11:30am

Present: John Coburn, Dave Smith, Andrea Reed, Sandra Metivier, Joel Fitzpatrick, Deanna Johnson, Calebe Wells, Karen Decker-Gendron, Emily Maclison, Jen Cook, Denise Sleeper, Sheila Mahon, Joyce Lanier, Angela Linke, Tobey Partch-Davies, Peter Darling, Nellie Goron, Emily Manire, Sheila Lambert, Denise St. Onge

Denise Sleeper invited John Coburn from the National Consortium for Health Systems Development (NCHSD) to this meeting to assist sub-group and help proposed pilots gain information on building performance measures that could be helpful to greater employment for people with disabilities and provide meaningful employment data for policy and management decisions.

Following introductions, an historical overview of the benefits and planning service system and how this evolved since the 1990s with key players like JoAnne Malloy was discussed. The question now becomes how do we transition providers to become knowledgeable and how to whom do we disseminate this information into the community and keep information current. Nellie Goron explained the structure behind the 3-tiered pyramid levels. The big picture for the infrastructure goes beyond training and will require follow-up and technical assistance support within a network of different organizations working together on all levels to be successful.

David Smith expressed that being able to bill Medicaid under mental health, can be done. John Coburn said that the person's responsibility can be a factor in billing that service, and mentioned that looking at building capacity in an honest way to get good outcomes by using the pilots was a good way to begin. He cited Indiana as having one of the best practice models nationally. Indiana has yearly recertification. They have service providers that were initially getting $100 per intake as an incentive, since time is often a factor in good outcomes. Consistency and follow up for trainings was stressed.

A distinction was made between state level certification and federal SSA certification, which includes a field assignment from Social Security that provides for the technical assistance needed. New Hampshire has CWICS that obtain TA from Soc. Sec. Nellie said they are apt to have weekly or monthly webinar trainings from VCU, and CWICs have access to Soc. Sec. NH Sheila Lambert made a reference to Voc Rehab having 2 WI specialist to help build capacity in New Hampshire.

John stressed that having a system that is set up to obtain information from both is important in getting to competency level 3 and that successful models have these together. Wisconsin has a

level 3 support center that has built the trust and has individuals that are both certified by Soc. Sec. and some that are not. Setting the system up so it's not cumbersome and with data collection that does not bear greater weight than outcomes is important to remember. Reporting formats also should be within a reasonable of time.

Questions raised by John during his presentation:
1. Ask - what is the point, what is important?
2. Numbers on performance areas for a project can be misleading to good outcomes – ask if this will be an effective measure or just busy work.
3. Is it result oriented?
4. Is it supported people working?
5. Are measures creating meaningful changes, even though people may say it's challenging?
6. Will benefits management to assure continued employment become key to keeping people in jobs?
7. Does Performance Area One speak to how successful people were in getting jobs and what was achieved from an event?
8. Does Performance Area Two speak that has 'action' steps that could speak to better outcomes.
9. Does Performance Area Three cover the county region for diverse and underserved groups?
10. Does Performance Area Four have an adequate response time?
11. Does Performance Area Five include comprehensive benefits management (beyond analysis) that provide for client reminders (such as when ending a trial work period) and who is assigned at level 2 or 3 to do this?
12. Does Performance Area Six provide for adequate supervision for staff development trainings?

# # #